

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **I. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-18 are pending with claims 1, 8, 13, 14, and 15 being independent.

### **II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 13, 15, and 17

Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 13, 15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jang (UK Patent No. 2,347,588) in view of Yamaguchi (U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0206518), further in view of Kida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,728 – hereinafter Kida) in view of Van Court (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,552 – hereinafter Van Court), in view of Kim (KR Application No. 2001-0059645), and further in view of Ross (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,576). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, “wherein,...said video processing means...**block-copies** the communication mode associated data and displays the block-copied **communication mode associated data** on the displayed television signal **when the television video signal is scaled up and displayed in the first and second display areas**” (emphasis added).

Acknowledging that none of the cited Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Van Court and Kim discloses the above-quoted feature, the Examiner cites Ross as allegedly curing this deficiency of these five references. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s assessment.

First, as noted in the March 7, 2010 Amendment, the above-quoted recitation has a timing element, namely “*when the television video signal is scaled up and displayed in the first and second display areas*” (emphasis added). In alleging that Ross discloses the above-quoted recitation, the Examiner, however, ignores this timing element. Hence, the Examiner fails to address the correct subject matter in connection with the above-quoted recitation. For this reason, the Examiner fails to

establish a prima facie case as to the above-quoted feature. The rejection of claim 1 should therefore be withdrawn.

Further, Ross does not disclose or suggest the above-quoted recitation. More specifically, Ross is directed to a TV display scheme for superimposing text of the teletext signal (of the TV signal) on the contemporaneous TV picture of the TV signal on TV display, where a predetermined area surrounding the text is manipulated to create reduced contrast so as to improve the legibility of the text. *See* abstract, col. 1, line 67 – col. 2, line 5 and the cited col. 2, lines 16-31 of Ross. In particular, the reduced contrast is created by causing a predetermined pattern of pixels of the received picture within the predetermined area to be switched to a constant background color. *See* col. 2, lines 10-15 and the cited col. 2, lines 16-31 of Ross.

However, teletext signal of a TV signal (from which the superimposed text is derived), by definition, is *part of the TV signal*. Thus, text of the teletext signal, to which Ross' scheme is directed to, at best is TV mode associated data, but is not *the communication mode associated data* recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, nowhere does Ross disclose or suggest *block-copying* of text of the teletext signal. The cited col. 5, lines 34-39, col. 2, lines 16-31 and col. 3, lines 18-27 of Ross disclose the mechanism used to create the reduced contrast (by causing a predetermined pattern of pixels of the received picture with the predetermined area to be switched to a constant background color), but is not relevant to *block-copying* of any kind of data.

Finally, Ross is irrelevant to the above-noted timing element, namely, "when the television video signal is scaled up and displayed in the first and second display areas", given that Ross' scheme is not disclosed as involving any operation performed when scaling up of a TV signal takes place.

Therefore, Ross does not disclose, teach, or suggest the above-quoted feature, namely, “wherein,...said video processing means...block-copies the communication mode associated data and displays the block-copied communication mode associated data on the displayed television signal when the television video signal is scaled up and displayed in the first and second display areas”, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Ross does not cure the acknowledged deficiencies of other cited references (namely, Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Van Court and Kim). The rejection of claim 1 should therefore be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 13 and 15 also contain subject matter related to that of claim 1. Accordingly, for the same reasons stated above in connection with claim 1, the rejection of claims 8, 13 and 15 should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 2, 3, 9 and 17 should be withdrawn at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 13, respectively.

Claims 4-7, 10-12, 14, 16 and 18

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Van Court, Kim and Ross, and further in view of Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,681,285). Claims 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Van Court, Kim and Ross, and further in view of Barile. Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Van Court, Kim and Ross, and further in view of Yui.

The rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1 and the fact that the cited secondary reference Ng does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Van Court, Kim and Ross.

Claim 14 contains subject matter related to that of claim 1. Therefore, for the same reasons stated above in connection with claim 1, the subject matter recited in claim 14 is also distinguishable from Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Van Court, Kim and Ross. Additionally, the cited secondary reference Barile does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Van Court, Kim and Ross. Therefore, the rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn.

The rejections of claims 4-7, 10, 11, 12 and 18 should be withdrawn at least by virtue of its dependency from claims 1, 8 and 14, respectively, and the fact that the cited secondary references Ng, Barile and Yui do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Jang, Yamaguchi, Kida, Van Court, Kim and Ross.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Should **any/additional** fees be required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 18-2220.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jundong Ma/

Jundong Ma  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 61,789

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
1300 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 659-9076

Dated: August 8, 2011